

REMARKS

Claims 21-34 are pending in the application.

Claims 21 and 24-27 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claims 28-32 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cutrer, and claims 28-31 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson. Claims 21-33 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,482,143. Claim 34 has been objected to as being dependent upon itself.

The enclosed terminal disclaimer and the Amendment place this case in condition for allowance because the applicants have complied completely with the Examiner's Office Action.

In particular, while the applicants respectfully disagree with the double patenting rejection, a terminal disclaimer is being filed herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection of claims 21-33.

Also, while the applicants do not agree with the Section 112 rejection, claim 21 has been amended to comply with the rejection and remove the subject matter which the Examiner believes does not comply with the written description requirement. Instead, the limitations of claim 22 which the Examiner did not reject on the art or on the basis of

failing to comply with the written description requirement has been moved into claim 21 with stylistic changes to make the claim read properly. It is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is therefore allowable as now presented.

Claims 22, 24, 26, and 27 have been canceled in order to comply with the Examiner's rejection. Claims 23 and 25 have been amended to comply with the written description requirement and depend from allowable claim 21. It is respectfully submitted that claims 23 and 25 are therefore allowable as now presented.

While the applicants do not agree with the Section 102(e) rejections, claims 28-32 have been canceled.

Claim 34 has been amended to correct its dependency (on claim 33) and is therefore allowable.

The applicants respectfully reserve the right to file a divisional application claiming the canceled subject matter.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain

outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



David P. Gordon
Reg. No. 29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
Ph:(203) 323-1800
Fax: (203) 323-1803

May 24, 2006